

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS 219 SOUTH DEARBORN STREET CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

312-435-6860

August 24, 2021

Mack H. Reed Madel PA 800 Hennepin Avenue 800 Pence Building Minneapolis, MN 55403 mreed@madellaw.com

Christopher Scott Griesmeyer Greiman, Rome & Griesmeyer, LLC 205 West Randolph St. Suite 2300 Chicago, IL 60606 cgriesmeyer@grglegal.com

Adam Scott Guetzow Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP 151 N. Franklin Street Suite 2500 Chicago, IL 60606 aguetzow@hinshawlaw.com

David Alfini Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP 151 N. Franklin Street Suite 2500 Chicago, IL 60606 dalfini@hinshawlaw.com Elliot S. Richardson Korey Richardson LLC 20 South Clark Street Suite 500 Chicago, IL 60603 erichardson@koreyrichardsonlaw.com

Amy Jo Hoffman Korey Richardson LLC 20 S. Clark Street Suite 500 Chicago, IL 60603 ahoffman@koreyrichardsonlaw.com

Bradley W.R. Gould 600 N. McClurg Ct. Apt 4104A Chicago, IL 60611

Daniel J Stoller Korey Richardson LLC 20 S. Clark Street Suite 500 Chicago, IL 60603 dstoller@koreyrichardsonlaw.com

Steven H. Jesser Attorney at Law, P.C. 2700 Patriot Boulevard Suite 250 Glenview, IL 60026-8021 shj@sjesser.com

In re: Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC v. Know Your Options, LLC d/b/a RCM Wealth Advisors et al., Case No. 15 CV 4648

Dear Counsel:

It has been brought to my attention that Judge James Zagel, who presided over the above-mentioned case and is now retired, may have owned stock in Wells Fargo. We have no reason to believe that his ownership of stock affected or impacted his decisions in this case. However, his stock ownership would have required recusal under the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and thus, I notify the parties of the conflict.

Case: 1:15-cv-04648 Document #: 98 Filed: 08/24/21 Page 2 of 2 PageID #:1168

<u>Advisory Opinion 71</u>, from the Judicial Conference Codes of Conduct Committee, provides the following guidance for addressing disqualification that is not discovered until after a judge has participated in a case:

[A]judge should disclose to the parties the facts bearing on disqualification as soon as those facts are learned, even though that may occur after entry of the decision. The parties may then determine what relief they may seek, and a court (without the disqualified judge) will decide the legal consequence, if any, arising from the participation of the disqualified judge in the entered decision. Although Advisory Opinion 71 contemplated disqualification after a Court of Appeals oral argument, the Committee explained "[s]imilar considerations would apply when a judgment was entered in a district court by a judge and it is later learned that the judge was disqualified."

With Advisory Opinion 71 in mind, you are invited to respond to this disclosure of a conflict in this case. Should you wish to respond, please submit your response on or before August 31, 2021. Any response will be considered by another judge of this court without the participation of Judge Zagel.

Sincerely.

Momas M. Sutur Clerk of Court